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The Committee reports to the Parliament as follows—

SUMMARY

1. The Committee applauds the Scottish Government, and the Scottish Parliament, for establishing world-leading climate change targets, and is delighted that Scotland is at the top of the European league table for emissions reductions, but believes it is essential to ensure Scotland achieves each annual target, as well as the overall emissions reduction set out in the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009¹.

2. As Scotland failed to meet the annual emissions abatement target for 2010, the final Second Report on Proposals and Policies must provide a framework that ensures future annual targets are met.

3. It is clear from the draft Second Report on Proposals and Policies (RPP2)² that there is only one combination of circumstances that will allow Scotland to meet each of its annual targets from 2013 until 2027. This requires implementation of all the proposals and policies in the draft RPP2, together with a shift in the EU wide emissions reduction target from the current target of 20%, to a target of 30%, as was envisaged when the 2009 Act was passed.

4. The Committee is therefore concerned that further annual targets, as set out in the 2009 Act, will be missed and recommends the Scottish Government ensure all proposals and policies outlined in the draft RPP2 are implemented. The Committee also recommends the Scottish Government work with the UK Government to apply all possible pressure to ensure the EU increases its emissions reduction target across the EU to 30%, and that

the final RPP2 be more explicit in demonstrating how greater domestic reductions could be achieved within the current 20% EU target.

5. The Committee is concerned that the draft RPP2 fails to strike the appropriate balance between policies and proposals. In the case of some of the large number of proposals it is unclear if and/or when they would become firm policies, and how these might be properly researched, monitored and funded. The Committee acknowledges the document looks ahead from the current year until 2027, and therefore recognises it may be difficult for the current Scottish Government to make firm policy and spending commitments. Nevertheless, it believes that, where possible, greater detail of how each proposal may be taken forward is required in the final RPP2.

6. The Committee welcomes the ten-page section in the draft RPP2 which addresses behaviour change, as it is firmly of the view that the Scottish Government, although the lead player in helping Scotland meet its emission reduction targets, must work in partnership with the UK Government, EU institutions, public and private sectors, civic society and individuals.

7. However, the Committee regrets the Scottish Government’s Behaviours Framework\(^3\) was not published alongside the draft RPP2 and was not available within a timescale that would have enabled the committees of the Scottish Parliament to properly scrutinise the document as part of this process.

8. The Committee makes specific comments on broader governance issues and all the policy aspects of the draft RPP2 within its remit in the main body of the report. However, the Committee particularly welcomes the inclusion of peatlands in the draft RPP2 and believes this is an area in which the Scottish Government could provide a global lead. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government’s planned consultation on this issue examines the level of support for, and appropriateness of, the proposed 21,000 hectare target for peatland restoration, and if this proves favourable, and other current areas of uncertainty are clarified, encourages the Scottish Government to adopt the proposal at the earliest possible opportunity.

9. The Committee also welcomes the forestry planting targets, and the proposal to encourage the use of Scottish timber in construction projects. The approach taken to waste is also welcomed, whilst recognising scope for some further strengthening and improvement.

10. However, the Committee believes that delivering desired levels of abatement from agriculture provides a significant challenge. This is due to the level of behaviour change required to deliver abatement within the sector, the limited scope and predicted abatement from the Farming for a Better Climate policy, and the lack of information and detail regarding the proposals, which account for significant volumes of abatement in the later

---

years of the draft RPP2. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government provide further clarity in all of these areas in the final RPP2 document.

11. Finally, the Committee welcomes the coordinated and collaborative approach taken by four committees of the Scottish Parliament in scrutinising the draft RPP2 within the tight timescale for Parliamentary scrutiny. The Committee believes this has resulted in more effective scrutiny of the document than would otherwise have been the case, increasing the possibility of a more robust final document being published by the Scottish Government, following the parliamentary debate.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Background

Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009

12. The Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009 (the 2009 Act) was passed by the Scottish Parliament in June 2009. The Act provides a statutory framework to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in Scotland by setting an interim 42% emissions reduction target for 2020, against a baseline year of 1990, with the power for this target to be varied based on expert advice and an 80% emissions reduction target for 2050. To help ensure the delivery of these targets, the Act also requires the Scottish Ministers to set annual targets for Scottish emissions from 2010 to 2050.

First report on proposals and policies (RPP1)

13. Under section 35 of the Act, a statutory report on proposals and policies (RPP) was required, setting out how the Scottish Government intended to meet its climate change targets from 2010-2022, including a target of 42% reduction by 2020. A draft report (draft RPP1) was laid in November 2010 and was subject to a 60-day period for parliamentary consideration. The draft RPP1 was structured around a number of chapters covering energy supply, homes and communities, business and the public sector, transport, rural land use and waste. Proposals and policies for meeting annual climate change emission reduction targets were identified for each chapter.

Parliamentary consideration of the draft RPP1

14. The draft RPP1 was considered by the former Transport Infrastructure and Climate Change (TICC) Committee, which had responsibility for scrutinising climate change matters in Session 3. The TICC Committee consulted a number of other committees on the draft RPP1. However, the timescale for considering and reporting was extremely challenging. The time for consideration was contracted further for those committees reporting to the TICC Committee, resulting in the former Rural Affairs and Environment (RAE) Committee declining to engage in the scrutiny process. The TICC Committee appended the report of the former Economy, Energy and Tourism (EET) Committee to its report\(^4\) but had little time to

---

review or comment on this. In considering the draft RPP1, there was some duplication and overlap in evidence to Committees and in stakeholder engagement.

15. The final Scottish Government report (RPP1), incorporating changes as a result of parliamentary scrutiny, was laid in March 2011.

DRAFT SECOND REPORT ON PROPOSALS AND POLICIES (RPP2)

Focus and scope of RPP2

16. The draft second report on proposals and policies (RPP2) was published on 30 January 2013 and focuses on how the climate change targets for 2013-2027 can be achieved.

17. The draft RPP2 defines a policy as a course of action which has been wholly or largely decided upon. In many cases policies will have committed funding and/or legislation and timescales. A proposal is a suggested course of action. Some proposals are set to become firm policies once development work is completed or when financial resources allow. The document also includes information on supporting or enabling measures. The draft RPP2 was accompanied by a technical annex, as required by the 2009 Act.

Parliamentary procedure for consideration of the draft RPP2

18. The Parliament has a period of 60 days, from the date of laying, in which to consider the draft RPP2 (of which a minimum of 30 must be days on which the Parliament is not dissolved or in recess). Once laid it is open to any parliamentary committee to consider relevant aspects of the draft RPP2 and report to the Parliament, after which there will be a debate in the Chamber.

19. Before laying the final report before Parliament, Scottish Ministers are required to have regard to—

- any representations on the draft report made to them;
- any resolution relating to the draft report passed by the Parliament; and
- any report relating to the draft report published by any Parliamentary committee.

20. The final RPP2 report must identify the changes (if any) that have been made in response to such representations, resolutions or reports and the reasons for those changes.

---


Parliamentary approach to scrutiny of the RPP2

A co-ordinated parliamentary approach to scrutiny

21. In seeking to apply the lessons learned in scrutinising the draft RPP1 and to further strengthen the mainstreaming of climate change scrutiny, the parliamentary committees with an interest in the draft RPP2 adopted a co-ordinated approach to scrutiny of the draft RPP2.

22. The Convener of the RACCE Committee wrote to the Conveners of three other committees Economy, Energy and Tourism (EET); Infrastructure and Capital Investment (ICI); and Local Government and Regeneration (LGR) to outline the following suggested approach—

- to issue a joint call for views with the EET, ICI and LGR Committees and to work as collaboratively as possible in relation to stakeholder communications and on media work;
- that individual committees report separately to the Parliament, ensuring as long a period as possible for each committee to take evidence and co-ordinate the publication of committee reports; and
- to seek to lodge a motion in the names of all four committees which report on the draft RPP2 for the Chamber debate.

Scrutiny focus of the Committees

23. Each committee focused its scrutiny on the issues within its respective remit and took evidence from stakeholders and the relevant Cabinet Secretaries/Ministers. The focus for the committees’ scrutiny was—

- **RACCE Committee**: development of RPP2; climate change governance (including monitoring); rural affairs (fisheries and agriculture); land use; resource use; and behaviour change;

- **EET Committee**: energy supply; heat; and business – energy efficiency;

- **ICI Committee**: housing – energy efficiency; transport; procurement; and the water industry;

- **LGR Committee**: communities; local government; and planning.

Key questions to be addressed

24. In scrutinising the draft RPP2, the key questions which were addressed by each of the committees within their respective remits were—

- the effectiveness of progress towards implementing the proposals and policies set out in the RPP1 and the appropriateness of the proposed adjustments to the proposals and policies within the RPP1;

- the effectiveness of the proposals and policies within the draft RPP2 for meeting the annual emissions targets;
• how these proposals and policies are likely to contribute towards the achievement of the interim target, the 2050 target and, in each target year, the domestic effort target; and

• the appropriateness of the timescales over which the proposals and policies within the draft RPP2 are expected to take effect.

Evidence

Written evidence
25. Given the interest of other committees, and to avoid duplication or gaps in scrutiny of the draft RPP2, a joint call for evidence\(^7\) was issued on 30 January 2013, with a deadline set for submissions of 20 February. This joint call was supplemented by specific areas of interest for each committee\(^8\) and was also cross-referenced to assist stakeholders.

26. The RACCE Committee received 11 written submissions. Details can be found at Annexe B.

Oral evidence
27. The Committee agreed to consider oral evidence on the draft RPP2 in a number of sessions. Three stakeholder evidence sessions were held over two meetings, followed by evidence sessions with the Minister for Environment and Climate Change and the Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and the Environment respectively.

28. The stakeholder evidence sessions on 6 February took the form of two round tables. The first roundtable focused on aspects of the draft RPP2 relating to rural affairs issues and land use. The second roundtable focused on behaviour change, waste, resource use, and the scope for technical innovation across the draft RPP2. The third stakeholder evidence session, on 20 February, focused on climate change governance, development of the draft RPP2 and some of the technical issues (e.g. domestic effort target and the differences between RPP1 and the draft RPP2). This also took the form of a roundtable. The final evidence sessions featured the Minister, covering wider climate change issues as well as peatland and forestry issues, and the Cabinet Secretary, covering the agricultural and waste aspects of the draft RPP2 as well as looking at marine issues.

29. Extracts from the minutes of all the meetings at which the draft RPP2 was considered can be found at Annexe A. Links to the Official Reports of the relevant meetings can be found at Annexe B, along with links to all written submissions.

30. The Committee thanks all those who submitted and gave evidence to it and appreciates the cooperation of stakeholders in operating within the tight timescales. The Committee also thanks the lead Scottish Government officials for


their cooperation throughout this process, and for providing briefing to the Committee informally before the formal process began.

**Briefing on the draft RPP2**

31. The Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe) published a briefing\(^9\) on the draft RPP2, which included scrutiny of the costings attached to the proposals and policies.

**BROAD/GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

32. With regard to its broad climate change remit, the Committee took particular interest in the first three chapters of the draft RPP2: Low Carbon Scotland; Background and Context; and Understanding and Achieving Transformation, and also in Chapter 10: Monitoring Impacts and Progress.

33. In terms of the other aspects of its remit, the Committee focused on Chapter 8: Waste and Resource Efficiency, and Chapter 9: Rural Land Use.

**Context**

34. The Committee believes it is important to set its report in the context of the comments in the draft RPP2, which states—

“Scotland is at the top of the European league table for emissions reductions. Between 1990-2010, emissions in Scotland fell by 22.8%. This is the largest reduction among the EU-15 Member States, and higher than the EU-27 Member States average of 14.3%, when emissions from international aviation and shipping and land use, land use change and forestry sectors are factored in.”\(^10\)

**Consultation**

35. The draft RPP2 states—

“We will consult, we will listen, and we will continue to learn from households, communities, non-government organisations, public sector partners, and business and industry as we adapt to new ways of doing things.”\(^11\)

36. The Scottish Government has invited public comment during the time of parliamentary consideration of the draft RPP2. However, it appears the draft RPP2 was developed without a great deal of public consultation on the document itself, aside from two formal stakeholder workshops.

---


37. The Committee asked stakeholders at its roundtable sessions to what extent they had been engaged in the preparation of the draft RPP2. Generally speaking, whilst there was not a specific consultation on the draft RPP2 itself, most witnesses were broadly of the view there had been significant engagement on the specific policy areas which, collectively, are reflected in the draft RPP2. It was also noted there had been engagement via the ClimateXChange group, the name given to Scotland’s Centre of Expertise on Climate Change.

38. There were some concerns raised by witnesses that whilst the engagement on the document had, in general, been positive, it was limited in terms of the number of consultees. Simon Pepper, former director of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Scotland, current board member of Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and member of Scotland’s 2020 Climate Group, noted that whilst he was consulted on the behaviour change aspects of the draft RPP2, he was not aware of consultation amongst other groups, which he described as “a concern.”

39. The Committee also notes the 60-day period which provides for parliamentary scrutiny of draft RPP documents in the 2009 Act can include periods when the Parliament is in recess, as long as these do not total more than 30 of the 60 available days. Scrutiny of the document is therefore likely to be under considerable time pressure, to allow for full involvement of stakeholders and the Scottish Government across all committees with an interest, publication of reports, and a debate of appropriate length in the chamber.

40. The Committee notes the Scottish Government did not formally consult on a proposed draft RPP2 document in advance of laying it before the Parliament. However, some of the policy areas relevant to the Committee that make up the draft RPP2 were consulted on and developed, to a certain extent, by stakeholder groups. The Committee is aware of the current consultation process on the draft RPP2 being run by the Scottish Government. The Committee encourages the Scottish Government to consider how it might best approach consultation on the next draft RPP particularly in terms of clarifying the process for, and timing of, both consultation and engagement.

41. With regard to the 60-day period afforded to the Parliament, under the 2009 Act, to scrutinise draft RPP documents, the Committee recognises that whilst this does constrict the time available for scrutiny, it would require primary legislation to alter this. However, the Committee is of the view that lessons can be learned from the scrutiny of both RPPs to date. The Committee recommends that, ahead of the draft RPP3 being laid, the Scottish Government work with the Scottish Parliament, to ensure that committees are as well informed as possible, in terms of advance documents and briefing, before the formal 60-day period begins, and that any associated documents are published alongside the draft RPP.

---

12 ClimateXChange is described on its website as: “[…] a collaborative initiative between sixteen of Scotland’s leading research and higher education institutions. We do research on climate change directly linked to the Scottish policy agenda. Our members provide evidence base for Scottish Government policy through timely and objective research evidence and expert advice.”

Effectiveness/analysis of RPP1 and the missed 2010 target

42. The Committee pursued the issue of whether RPP1 had been effective to date, given that the first annual target, in 2010, had been missed. The general consensus was RPP1 has not been as effective as it could, or indeed should, have been. In giving evidence to the Committee, Mike Robinson, Chief Executive of the Royal Scottish Geographic Society and board member of both Stop Climate Chaos Scotland (SCCS) and Scottish Environment Link (SE Link) and a member of the Climate 2020 Group, said the RPP1 had not been effective overall—

“Although RPP1 has had its moments and contains a number of positives, it has been difficult to translate it into something that groups can adopt and to understand some of the detail of what is required to deliver carbon reductions.”

43. James Curran, the Chief Executive of the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), noted that it was difficult to say RPP1 had been properly effective given the first annual target for emissions reduction set by the 2009 Act had been missed in 2010. He felt two lessons should be learnt from RPP1: firstly, real-time monitoring of progress is required (as currently, carbon assessment in Scotland is subject to a significant time delay); and secondly, that the practical delivery of measures in the RPP2 is prioritised.

44. Dr Andy Kerr, an executive director of the Edinburgh Centre for Carbon Innovation, and a member of the Climate 2020 Group, agreed with those sentiments, telling the Committee RPP1 worked as a collection of policies and proposals for each relevant sector, but did not work as a delivery action plan.

45. SCCS stated, in its written evidence, that it was concerned about the lack of detailed analysis and monitoring of the existing policies within RPP1 and believed the draft RPP2 did not set out the transparency of progress on RPP1 called for by Audit Scotland in its 2011 report.\(^\text{15}\)

46. Some witnesses identified particular sections of RPP1 which had been effective. Jim Densham, from SE Link, pointed to the forestry planting target policy, and specific policy issues are discussed elsewhere in this report.

47. Professor Pete Smith, from the University of Aberdeen and the science director for ClimateXChange, noted the different focuses and contexts of RPP1 and the draft RPP2—

“Under RPP1, we are doing the easy stuff—we are picking the low-hanging fruit and getting the win-wins and the efficiency gains. As we move forward to RPP2 and as RPP2 evolves when we move further into the future, the low-


hanging fruit will have been picked, so we will inevitably come across win-lose situations, rather than win-win situations.”\footnote{16}

48. With regard to the missed target in 2010, Dr Ute Collier, from the Committee on Climate Change (CCC), told the Committee that whilst the target had indeed been missed, when weather-adjusting for the cold winter in 2010 was taken into account, the underlying trend showed falling emissions, which was to be welcomed. She added that the CCC was not overly concerned with the missed 2010 target, but rather with tackling the situation going forward.

49. The Minister noted that the 2010 target was predominantly missed due to the extreme weather conditions, which saw the coldest winter since 1919 and this affected countries beyond Scotland. He accepted that lessons needed to be learned from the experience so that the Scottish Government could better plan for any future extreme weather situations in terms of knock-on effects on climate change targets. The Minister stated—

“If we can improve the clarity on how we hope to claw back the abatement needed to make up for the missed 2010 target, we will do so.”\footnote{17}

50. The backdrop of Scotland missing its first annual climate change target in 2010 by 2% brings into sharp focus the need for RPP2 to be as robust as possible in helping Scotland meet its future annual targets.

51. The Committee welcomes the Minister’s commitment to provide greater clarity, if possible, on its response to the missed target in 2010 in the final RPP2 document and recommends the Scottish Government ensure this takes place.

52. The Committee acknowledges the comments made by some witnesses that there are significant lessons to be learned from the experience of RPP1, especially with regard to translating policies and proposals into successfully delivered action on the ground, and analysis and monitoring of policies that are in place. The Committee recommends that the Scottish Government take note of these points and ensure that the final RPP2 is clear on both how policies and proposals (where possible) will be delivered, monitored and evaluated.

Presentation of RPP2

53. A consensus emerged in evidence given to the Committee that it was not as easy as it should be to read across between RPP1 and the draft RPP2, or to compare the two documents.

54. In its written evidence to the Committee, SCCS criticised the way the document had been presented and the language used in it. SCCS said the draft RPP2 provides less information than RPP1 and proposals were often described in

\footnote{17} Scottish Parliament Rural Affairs, Climate Change and Environment Committee. Official Report, 27 February 2013, Col 1799.
vague terms. It also criticised the document for not containing percentage reductions per sector compared to the 1990 baseline, unlike RPP1, which, it said “makes it difficult to analyse the level of savings being attributed to meeting targets.”

55. In response, the Minister told the Committee—

“RPP2 replaces RPP1, and our intention is to present a coherent set of proposals. As you will appreciate, the document is 168 pages long, with 77 pages of technical annex. It is already quite complex. We are trying to learn from this exercise, and we know that there are some presentational issues, which we can work on for the final version. We are trying to present a coherent set of proposals and policies without constant reference to the previous report, which would end up confusing the reader. RPP2 stands on its own in that regard, and that is the intention.”

56. Other witnesses pointed to the lack of delineation in the draft RPP2, i.e. a failure to state clearly at what level policies or proposals would be taken forward (Scottish national level, Scottish local level, UK, EU) and by whom (public and private sectors, and civil society).

57. The Minister told the Committee he would consider providing further tables in the final RPP2 document if they would be helpful in understanding the document. He also gave a commitment to improve, where possible, clarity and explanation of how, and by whom, policies and proposals would be taken forward.

58. The Committee notes the comments made in evidence regarding the presentation of the document and the difficulties in the read-across and comparison between RPP1 and the draft RPP2. The Committee sympathises with these concerns, especially given there is a statutory requirement under the 2009 Act for the final RPP2 to assess progress of the policies and proposals set out in RPP1. The Committee therefore welcomes the Minister's commitment to reflect on these issues before finalising RPP2 as it believes it is important the final document is as accessible and transparent as possible.

59. The Committee also recommends the Scottish Government add percentage reductions per sector, where possible, compared to the 1990 baseline to the final RPP2 document, and also provide further information in the final document on who will deliver particular policies and proposals.

Overall assessment of the draft RPP2's likely effectiveness

60. Annexe B of the draft RPP2 outlines how many of the annual targets between 2013 and 2027 would be met under four different possible scenarios—

- if the policies in the draft RPP2 are implemented, and the EU emissions reduction target remains at 20%, as is currently the case, only one out of a possible 15 annual targets would be met;

---

18 Stop Climate Chaos Scotland. Written submission.
• If all the policies and proposals in the draft RPP2 were to be implemented, and the EU emissions reduction target remains at 20%, eight out of a possible fifteen annual targets would be met;

• If the policies in the draft RPP2 were to be implemented and the EU were to move to an emissions reduction target of 30%, seven out of fifteen annual targets would be met; and

• If all the policies and proposals in the draft RPP2 were to be implemented and the EU moved to a 30% target, then all fifteen annual targets would be met.

61. The draft RPP2 also states that, due to a revision of the 1990 baseline figures, the 2020 annual target now equates to a 43.66% reduction in emissions, rather than the 42% reduction set out in the 2009 Act. This was welcomed by Dr Richard Dixon, the director of Friends of the Earth Scotland and a board member of Stop Climate Chaos Scotland, who told the Committee—

“The Government could have changed the 2020 target and all the annual targets in between to make up for the fact that the baseline was different, because the secondary legislation locks in actual carbon numbers—for example, it specifies 57 million tonnes in a certain year. It would have been a lot of bother to take that through Parliament, but the Government could have done it. I welcome the fact that the Government did not decide to do that and is sticking with the fact that we must now reduce emissions by 43.66 per cent to meet the targets.”

62. SEPA gave the following overall assessment of the draft RPP2—

“We are […] concerned that there is more that needs to be done in order to make the RPP fit for the purpose of delivering world leading climate legislation. There is a need in our view, for a step change in the ambition of RPP2, particularly in the light of the first annual target having been missed.”

63. These sentiments were echoed across the evidence given to the Committee.

SCCS was critical of the ambition and likely effectiveness of the draft RPP2, stating—

“[…] the current draft does not provide a credible plan for fulfilling the requirements of the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009.”

64. SCCS summarised the key areas where, in its opinion, the draft RPP2 did not deliver and lacked credibility—

• an overreliance on proposals rather than policies;

---

21 SEPA. Written submission.
22 Stop Climate Chaos Scotland. Written submission.
23 Stop Climate Chaos Scotland. Written submission.
• an assumption the EU will change its climate change target;
• a lack of transparency to allow independent assessment;
• emissions abatement potential either unexplained or overstated;
• a lack of monitoring of existing policies to assess the effectiveness of RPP1;
• a lack of milestones to facilitate future evaluation; and
• an insufficient integration of a strategic approach to low carbon behaviour change.

65. James Curran, from SEPA, also noted that RPP2 lacked “headroom”\textsuperscript{24}, in other words, sufficient flexibility and alternatives to ensure targets would be met. Many other witnesses agreed the draft RPP2 lacked sufficient flexibility, such as Lady Susan Rice, the Managing Director of Lloyds Banking Group Scotland and member of the Climate 2020 Group, and Dr Richard Dixon. Dr Andy Kerr told the Committee—

“I was also looking for what the plan Bs might be if the plan As do not work, as they invariably will not in some cases.”\textsuperscript{25}

66. There was also a view expressed by Dr Richard Dixon that the draft RPP2 did not provide an appropriately urgent response to the first annual target, in 2010, being missed. He noted the approach taken in the draft RPP2 is to make up the missed target over a longer period of time, rather than taking immediate action, which Dr Dixon believed was an approach that could lead to future missed annual targets.

67. In terms of monitoring and evaluation, there was a strong consensual view expressed that the draft RPP2 could be improved in this regard across the piece. Ute Collier, from the CCC, told the Committee there was some exemplar work in this area happening elsewhere in the UK, looking beyond just carbon emissions, such as in Wales in particular, and suggested the Scottish Government might wish to look to the monitoring and evaluation happening at a Welsh and UK level, in order to improve the situation in Scotland—

“We suggest that that kind of thing is necessary to help achieve better monitoring. It would help us as the independent adviser if we could review it annually, especially given the current problem of the emissions data being 18 months behind.”\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{26} Scottish Parliament Rural Affairs, Climate Change and Environment Committee. \textit{Official Report}, 20 February 2013, Col 1758.
68. The Minister told the Committee that the purpose of the document was to outline both policies and proposals, and proposals in the document would be subject to consultation and further consideration before they were firmed up as policies or not. He added that, given the uncertainties involved in looking ahead to 2027, it was to be expected that there would be a significant number of proposals and it would not be appropriate to state these as policies at the current time, ahead of consultation and proper due consideration.

69. The Committee addresses the details of those aspects of the draft RPP2 relevant to it in the “Specific policy issues” section of this report below. However, in broad terms, there was a consensus in the evidence given to the Committee that the document did not go far enough in providing the step-change so many believe is necessary to deliver the carbon emission reductions required under the 2009 Act.

70. The generally held view was that the draft RPP2 relies more on proposals rather than policies, lacks detail on policy delivery (both in terms of how these would be delivered, and where responsibility for this would lie) and flexibility and is insufficiently clear on how the policies and proposals in the document will be properly researched, monitored and evaluated going forward.

71. Whilst recognising that as the draft RPP2 looks ahead until 2027 there will inevitably be a degree of uncertainty and assumption within it, the Committee acknowledges these concerns and agrees the draft document needs to be strengthened, and notes this was accepted by the Minister when he gave evidence to the Committee.

Scope for technical innovation

72. The draft RPP2 states the Scottish Government intends—

“to choose the most cost effective mix of technologies and approaches in any sector, the reality is that, in many cases, we do not yet know how technologies will develop, or how their costs will change or what other disruptive technologies might emerge. We aim where reasonable and practical, to encourage a portfolio of technologies and create competitive market conditions in which the most sustainable and cost effective succeed over time”.27

73. The Committee explored whether this level of ambition (and the level of abatement attributed to technical innovation) was reasonable, given that many of the technologies referred to are not currently developed.

74. Dr Andy Kerr told the Committee he had no issue with the wording used in the draft RPP2, and believed the Scottish Government was right not to try to specify in the draft RPP2 exactly which technologies should be taken forward. However, he added that technology innovation in itself would not deliver the

---

change required, but had to be combined with the necessary social and business innovation.

75. However, Mike Robinson told the Committee that the wording in the draft RPP2 was “slightly in danger of going into the wishful-thinking zone.” He stressed that, in his view, delivering reductions in emissions should be focused more on the adaptation and use of existing technology, rather than the development of new technology.

76. Professor Mike Bonaventure suggested a risk register should be considered to assess policy implementation and political risks to develop a better understanding about the extent to which the draft RPP2 can deliver in the long term, an idea supported by Dr Andy Kerr.

77. The Committee believes the statement by the Scottish Government regarding the scope for technical innovation is reasonable and appropriate, given the uncertainties involved in the development of new technology, looking ahead to 2027.

78. However, as outlined elsewhere in this report, the Committee received a significant volume of evidence which questioned the emissions reductions attributed to proposals relating to this measure (such as the developments in agricultural technology) and the high level of uncertainty attached. The Committee sympathises with these concerns and recommends the Scottish Government reconsider whether, given the acknowledged uncertainties, the final RPP2 provides sufficient explanation of how the attributed level of reductions from proposals relating directly to possible innovation of technology have been arrived at. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 provides as much information as possible on technical innovation proposals throughout the document, including detail on how it intends to continue to evaluate these proposals in the future.

79. The Committee notes the suggestion made by Professor Bonaventura that the Scottish Government consider developing a risk register in order to better assess the longer-term policies and proposals in the draft RPP2, some of which may rely on new technology. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government give this proposal full consideration.

Appropriateness of timescales

80. SCCS noted that, unlike RPP1, RPP2 does not include any milestones of progress for specific sectors. SCCS added—

“This significantly weakens the document as it removes an important means of judging progress and adjusting implementation to ensure emissions targets are met.”
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81. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, several witnesses noted concerns about the amount of abatement in the draft RPP2, which is designated to the later years of the period it covers (post 2020), and the need to consider more frontloading of activity. SE Link stated—

“It is generally accepted that early action to cut emissions is vital (especially for our natural environment) and also cheaper than later spending. However, the RPP’s credibility is undermined by the majority of effort being planned for years post 2020. This can be observed clearly in the Rural Land Use sector. We cannot afford to wait until the 2020s to start taking action.”

82. The Committee acknowledges it is difficult for any government to predict with certainty the level of abatement that might occur in seven to fourteen years’ time. However, the Committee notes concerns raised about both the lack of information on how the RPP2 will be monitored to assess progress and the amount of abatement which it states will occur towards the end of the period covered by the RPP2.

83. The Committee therefore encourages the Scottish Government to provide clarity on both how progress will be measured for each sector in RPP2, and how the abatement projected from 2020 to 2027 will be practically achieved.

EU climate change target

84. As mentioned elsewhere in this report, the EU currently has a target for reducing carbon emissions across the EU by 20% by 2020. There has been pressure from some member states to increase this target to 30% (although, there is also significant resistance to increasing the target from other member states). The draft RPP2 gives predictions for carbon abatement in scenarios where an EU target of 20% is in place, and where an EU target of 30% is in place.

85. The Committee explored the likelihood of the EU changing its target, and the implications for Scotland if it did not, given that the draft RPP2 clearly states that the only way Scotland can meet all of its annual targets until 2027 is if the EU increases its target to 30%.

86. All evidence to the Committee on this issue agreed that increasing the EU target was vital if Scotland was to achieve its annual targets and encouraged the Scottish and UK Government’s to maximise efforts to achieve this. A consensus was also expressed in stakeholder evidence that, given the EU uncertainty, it was vital domestic efforts were maximised, in order to achieve the targets set in the 2009 Act.

87. The Minister told the Committee—

“The extremely challenging targets were initially set on the assumption of the Committee on Climate Change that there would be a European Union-wide 30 per cent target, and we are disappointed that that has not yet been
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achieved, although we continue to be optimistic that it can be achieved when the European Council considers the matter in 2014-15, so it is not over yet—we are very much pushing for that.”

88. The Committee is concerned by the seeming over-reliance in the draft RPP2 of the EU increasing its emissions reduction target from 20% to 30%. Whilst the Committee shares the Minister’s disappointment that the move to a 30% target has still not been achieved, and supports the Scottish Government in working with the UK Government to put maximum pressure on the EU to increase its target, it recommends that the final RPP2 be more explicit in demonstrating how greater domestic reductions could be achieved within the current 20% EU target.

Purchasing carbon unit credits

89. The Committee explored with witnesses whether they could envisage a situation whereby the Scottish Government would have to seek to buy carbon units on the international market for Scotland to reach its targets. Dr Richard Dixon told the Committee that although it would be possible to buy credits in future years, he felt all possible action should be taken to achieve the targets through domestic effort, and to avoid buying credits from overseas. Judith Robertson, the Head of Oxfam Scotland and Stop Climate Chaos Scotland Director, supported this view, and added that purchasing credits would not help the global climate change challenge.

90. The Minister confirmed to the Committee that the Scottish Government had the power to use such credits, but the current administration had no intentions to make use of the powers, and planned to focus on domestic effort.

91. The Committee notes the comments made on the possibility of the Scottish Government purchasing carbon unit credits in future years to help Scotland meet its annual emissions reduction targets. The Committee supports the Scottish Government’s position that it has no current plans to purchase credits and wishes to focus on domestic effort to reach the targets set out in the 2009 Act.

Cost of policies and proposals in the draft RPP2

92. The Committee explored in some detail the projected cost of the policies and proposals in the waste and rural land use chapters of the draft RPP2. Much of the evidence given to the Committee highlighted a lack of detail in the projected costs of proposals in particular.

93. Dr Ute Collier told the Committee that as the document looked ahead to 2027, it was acceptable, to some extent, that some of the costing projections lacked detail, but added that she did feel it would be helpful to provide more details on where the costs might be expected to fall.

94. James Curran, of SEPA, noted he did not feel the issue of cost, in itself, was where the focus should be, but rather the scheduling of associated costs across the time period was what was important.

95. Dr Andy Kerr told the Committee—

“There has been a tendency to think that because the RPP2 is a national Government document, the Government has to spend lots of money to deliver it. We have talked about this before, but it is very much about creating the conditions under which we can also encourage private investment, because there are huge opportunities to deliver fairly radical change. Markets in this space are growing around the world.”

96. The Committee notes the draft RPP2 details the projected costs of proposals in the rural land use chapter as jumping from £16m in 2019, to £321m in 2020, and pursued the reason behind this huge leap with the Minister.

97. The Minister told the Committee that this spike in projected costing was due to broad assumptions that had been made in modelling exercises about the projected costs of proposals that would be brought forward in those years, such as the proposal for developments in agricultural technology from 2020. He noted the process was an inexact science in that respect—

“Forecasting is a difficult business at the best of times. Sometimes we are happy if we get the direction of change right, let alone the scale of change. That is not a general criticism of my colleagues in economics; the point is that it is extremely difficult to predict and forecast accurately. Any degree of uncertainty about underlying assumptions adds to the difficulty of projecting and forecasting accurately. All we can do is use the best available figures, sense check them to see whether they seem to be reasonable and come back with an explanation if they look in any way like glorious assumptions.”

98. Dr Richard Dixon told the Committee the draft RPP2 provided information on overall costs but was not clear on what proportion of those would be public or private expenditure and what the costs would be to the public. He also expressed a frustration about how the draft RPP2 failed to outline all of the benefits of achieving emissions reductions—

“We have one large figure for implementation and a smaller figure for the benefits to society of doing all this stuff—whether that is better health, or less air pollution, or more cohesive communities—but the numbers are incomplete. From the figures in RPP2, we could conclude that there will be a net benefit, but if it contained a full benefit analysis, we might conclude that what it contains is the right thing for Scotland to do socially and economically as well as for climate change. Obviously, civil servants have worked hard to get the benefits numbers into the document, but because the numbers are

---

not complete, it is difficult for Parliament and the committee to see the full picture."\textsuperscript{34}

99. Felix Spittal, a Policy Officer with SCVO, agreed with this point, telling the Committee the draft RPP2 did not provide much information on the health and social benefits of the various policies and proposals.

100. Dr Richard Dixon also highlighted a disconnect, in his view, between how the Scottish Government approaches its budget planning overall, and documents such as the draft RPP2—

"There is a study down south that shows that, if you spend £1 insulating someone’s home, you will get nearly 50p back in savings in the health budget, because you have made those people healthier. I do not think that the Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and the Environment has spoken to the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Wellbeing and said, “Give me some of your budget so that I can spend it on insulation, which will save you money.” That is the sort of conversation that people need to be having. The costs and benefits in the RPP are separate from the discussions that the Government and Parliament have about the budget. Particularly when it comes to money, we need to be much more joined up."\textsuperscript{35}

101. The Minister told the Committee he was aware of the critical comments that had made regarding the transparency of the projected costs within the draft RPP2 and would reflect on this with a view to improving the final document where possible. He explained that with some of the proposals (he gave an example of peatland restoration) it was not yet possible, or appropriate, to set out where exactly all the costs would fall, as further work is still to be carried out in terms of how proposals would be taken forward, which would often include full consultation exercises. The Minister said, for that reason, it was sensible to not be overly prescriptive in the draft RPP2.

102. The Minister noted the points raised with regard to costs and benefits beyond the purely financial, and the need to work across all parts of the Scottish Government. He reassured the Committee that he worked very closely with Cabinet Secretary and Ministerial colleagues, and agreed the link up, in economic, environment and social terms, between areas such as health and wellbeing and the environment, was extremely important.

103. In response to questioning about whether the final RPP2 document should contain more explicit examples and explanation of such costs and benefits, the Minister told the Committee—

"[…] you are right that we have not set out in full the societal benefits and any other benefits that might be assumed. A number of additional benefits might


The Committee appreciates that estimating the costs of proposals that might be implemented between 2020 and 2027 is a challenging task that will, by its very nature, contain a degree of uncertainty. However, the cost estimates given for proposals in the rural land use part of the document in particular do not currently contain sufficient information on how they have been arrived at to enable robust analysis. The Committee therefore recommends the Scottish Government provide further information and breakdown of these costs in the final RPP2 document.

The Committee also recommends that the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 provides further details on the scheduling of costs across the 2013-2027 period and where the responsibility for meeting those costs lies.

The Committee notes the comments made that the draft RPP2 could provide a clearer explanation and analysis of all of the economic, environmental and social benefits that each policy and proposal could deliver and notes the Minister’s remarks suggesting such information could be provided in the final RPP2. The Committee encourages the Scottish Government to do this.

The Committee also notes the views expressed that a more joined-up approach is required between the identification of costs in the draft RPP2 and the Scottish Government’s wider budget planning and documents. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government give consideration to this, both in the final RPP2 document, and in future budget documents.

Behaviour change

Section 3.5 of the draft RPP2 recognises and discusses the importance of understanding and influencing behaviour as one of five cross-cutting themes of transformation. This section of the document gives an analysis of the issue, including case studies from Scotland and abroad, but does not outline any specific policies or proposals.

The draft RPP2 states that the Scottish Government will publish a Low Carbon Scotland: Behaviours Framework “while this draft is being considered by the Scottish Parliament”. Unfortunately, that document had not been published by the time the Committee concluded its evidence taking, on 28 February 2013, an issue several witnesses noted as not being helpful.

The document was subsequently published on 4 March 2013. The timing of publication meant the Committee was not able to comment on it in any meaningful way in this report. However, the Minister confirmed to the Committee that he would be happy to respond to any points the Committee might raise with him on the

---

framework, outwith this report. From an initial examination of the document, it does not appear to be specific to every sector.

111. SCCS welcomed the section in the draft RPP2 on behaviour change, which it described as “a step forward” and supported the three contexts of individual, social and material change. However, it also stated there was a lack of detail on how the behaviour change agenda would be integrated in the policies and proposals for different sectors, and that all proposals and policies that dealt with the provision of funding, information and advice should be accompanied by engagement strategies based on the most recent behaviour change research.

112. Other evidence to the Committee noted regret at the slow progress being made on changing behaviour. Simon Pepper told the Committee—

“We need to create a situation, as soon as possible, where the prevailing attitude is that our current behaviour and habits are completely unacceptable and irresponsible. That is the level of ambition that needs to be in there, but I do not see it.”

113. Given that the behaviours framework document was not published when the Committee took evidence from stakeholders, discussion focused instead on what witnesses hoped to see in the framework.

114. Morag Watson, a senior policy officer with WWF Scotland, told the Committee that she hoped to see the behaviours framework contain firm policies and proposals laid out in detail, to take the section in the draft RPP2 on a stage further. Specifically, the actions she was looking for went beyond the remit of the RACCE Committee, into areas such as transport and home energy use.

115. With regard to the communication aspects of getting the behaviour change message across, Morag Watson praised the Scottish Government’s greener Scotland website for incorporating the latest behaviour change research, but regretted that the draft RPP2 had not done the same and was written in language which she described as “not helpful for supporting particular behaviour change and action on that.”

116. Simon Pepper told the Committee he believed there were three key areas that the behaviours framework should be based upon: 1) emphasis of importance; 2) integration; and 3) promotion as an opportunity. He also told the Committee—

“One of the problems is the label “behaviour change”, because it tends to focus the mind on individual action whereas, in strategic terms, we need to
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concentrate on societal attitudes and norms. I like to think of it more as culture change.”\textsuperscript{41}

117. It was recognised by some that the waste sector had a successful story to tell about domestic behaviour change, from which much could be learnt. Linda Ovens, representing the Chartered Institution of Wastes Management, noted the challenge for the waste industry was now in extending the success of domestic behaviour change into the private sector.

118. Andrew Bauer, a policy manager from the NFUS, highlighted the challenges ahead regarding changing behaviour in the farming community in particular—

“Delivering behaviour change in Scottish livestock farms en masse will be a time consuming and resource-intensive process. If we want to do it, we have to put in the resources. I do not see it happening any other way.”\textsuperscript{42}

119. When questioned on the nature of the resources that might be required, Mr Bauer highlighted that the current budget for the Farming for a Better Climate programme is approximately £100,000, which equated to something in the region of £5 per farm in Scotland, which would not, in his view, deliver the sort of behaviour change across Scottish agriculture that was required. This point was supported by Jim Densham, from RSPB Scotland and SE LINK.

120. Conscious of the significant challenge ahead in changing behaviour in the farming industry in particular, the Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that there were case studies which demonstrated the many benefits of reducing carbon emissions to farmers, showing how they could cut costs, increase profits and reduce carbon emissions at the same time. He added that the Behaviours Framework, due for publication on 4 March, was not expected to be a sectoral document and would not go into detail about behaviour change within farming specifically. He did, however, accept the final RPP2 document could provide more examples and details regarding how this challenge could be addressed.

121. James Curran, of SEPA, outlined the responsibility for delivering the behaviour change that he felt was ultimately required if Scotland is to meet its climate change targets—

“The effort that we are involved in needs to be presented as Scotland’s challenge. I give credit to all members of the Scottish Parliament for what I perceive to be the strong cross-party support for the efforts that Scotland is making on climate change. To me, that demonstrates a high degree of leadership. We should be building on that. This is Scotland’s challenge—it is a challenge to each and every one of us to contribute what we can and drive

the multiple benefits, as Simon Pepper said. We should present ourselves as the world leader in delivery as well as in aspiration.”

122. The theme of the contribution different sections of public and private society can make to changing culture and behaviour and therefore helping to achieve climate change targets was explored by the Committee in some detail. The Committee questioned witnesses on the role they felt civic society should play, and in particular, the various pressure groups and umbrella bodies which exist in the climate change policy field. The Committee also explored how communities and people on lower incomes could be supported to deliver behaviour change.

123. Simon Pepper noted the Scottish Government’s Climate Challenge Fund provided support for communities in this regard but also felt that more work could be done with other community groups, which could be highly effective in encouraging people to adopt different behaviour patterns and deliver cultural change. Dr Andy Kerr agreed that the human and social capital element had often been missing from the policy framework to date, but felt the Scottish Government was taking steps to address this.

124. Morag Watson told the Committee assumptions were often made about how to best engage people on lower incomes which were not always correct—

“Money is a very big issue for people with low incomes, and there is a tendency to think that messages to them should be shaped around finances, but that is generally not helpful. We find that people’s comfort and their health are of greater concern to them.”

125. Some witnesses also suggested there were different motivating factors in driving cultural change, for different sections of society. It was suggested that financial incentives are not actually predominant for most individuals, rather they are more greatly motivated by a sense of moral duty and by, as Morag Watson put it “the kind of person they are”. She also suggested that for many farmers, something other than only financial reward motivated them, given the balance between effort and financial reward in much of the sector. However, Professor Mike Bonaventura said for many SMEs, the financial message was very important, and probably more so than issues such as social justice.

126. Dr Louise Maythorne, from the University of Edinburgh, stated in written evidence that environmental movement organisations (EMO’s) had a very strong role to play in the delivery of the draft RPP2—

“Although the RPP2 recognises the importance of EMO actors in the delivery of report’s targets, it does not suggest any mechanisms through which they might be involved in the iteration and delivery of these targets.”

127. She went on to recommend—

“[…] the creation of a forum, into which the interests of multiple stakeholders across the spectrum of public, civic, business and EMO actors would be fed […] Such a body would provide a stable and systematic platform for the inclusion of EMOs in the government’s work towards climate change abatement, enhance the opportunities for innovation and extend the reach of the government’s policies into the community.”

128. The Minister stressed to the Committee that behaviour change was not about Government alone, but accepted it was for the Scottish Government to provide leadership and help people, in all walks of life, to embrace the cultural and behavioural change required. He noted that NGO membership organisations, such as the RSBP, National Trust for Scotland, Stop Climate Chaos, and World Wildlife Fund, had hundreds of thousands of members in Scotland and therefore needed to continue to work constructively with the Scottish Government to reinforce messages and seek to positively influence their respective members.

129. The Minister also spoke about the role that the public sector, local government and community groups had to play in helping to change behaviour—

“about a quarter of the population in Scotland works in the public sector. As public sector organisations, we therefore have many people who are parts of families and communities and have a role to play. We have a leadership role to play in the public sector—for example, in informing public sector workers what the impacts can be and what they can do. We hope that they will set good examples in their communities and that people will take appropriate action. We cannot control the behaviour of individuals, but if we can provide information to our staff and colleagues about what they can do, that will be an immediate early win. There may be some crossover with the mass membership organisations, but we in the public sector are dealing with a much larger group of people, and we can, using local government services, address messages to our workers and to people about what they can do. We have an ability to connect with a lot of people—in the workforce and in the population more generally. COSLA and local government in general have a hugely important role to play in that. Local organisations—through community planning partnerships or other routes—also have an important role to play in delivering the messages.”

130. The Committee welcomes the ten-page section in the draft RPP2 which addresses behaviour change, as it is firmly of the view that only through successful culture and behaviour change across the population will climate change ambitions truly be realised. The Committee concurs with the view of James Curran, of SEPA, that this is Scotland’s challenge.

131. However, the Committee regrets the Scottish Government’s Behaviours Framework was not published alongside the draft RPP2 and was not
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published within a timescale that would have enabled the committees of the Parliament to scrutinise the document as part of this process.

132. The Behaviours Framework document was published on 4 March 2013, and it appears, on initial reading, to lack the sectoral information, detail and substance that many stakeholders told the Committee they were hoping for. The Committee therefore welcomes the commitment given by the Minister to respond to any observations or questions on the Behaviours Framework the Committee may have outwith the publication of this report. The Committee may also pursue issues relating to the Framework in the chamber debate on the draft RPP2 expected at the end of March 2013.

133. The Committee is of the view that the Scottish Government, although a lead player in helping Scotland meet its emission reduction targets, cannot bring about behaviour change alone. Success in this regard will require joint-working the UK Government, EU institutions, public and private sectors, and with civic society and individuals.

134. The Committee therefore recommends that the Scottish Government provide further detail on—

- how all sections of society, including people on low incomes, can play a vital part in creating the level of culture and behaviour change required;

- who will lead on the work across the various sectors; and

- how the behaviour change required will be informed, inspired, funded and delivered.

SPECIFIC PORTFOLIO ISSUES

Waste and resource use

Policies
135. Chapter 8 of the draft RPP2 covers greenhouse gas emissions that arise from waste and resource use. The chapter outlines the Scottish Government’s ambitions for decarbonising waste; describes the current position; states the policies which will deliver this; outlines proposals for going further; describes the relevant supporting and enabling measures; and ends with sections on costs and benefits and a summary of abatement of policies and proposals.

136. In the document, the Scottish Government refers to the issue of lowering emissions resulting from landfilling of domestic waste as “waste and resource efficiency”. The document focuses on actions relating to waste disposal, with 90% of this section afforded to that topic. The Committee received evidence raising concerns that this section was overly focused on waste and missed an opportunity to broaden the thinking on wider aspects of resource use. The report returns to this theme later in this section.
137. The draft RPP2 sets out what a Low Carbon Scotland will encompass, for the resource use sector,—

“At least 70% [of] all waste will be recycled by 2025, and by 2050 waste as we know it now will have been designed out of our economy.”

138. The draft RPP2 confirms that measures set out in the Zero Waste Plan remain the primary policy framework to progress waste objectives. In particular, the draft RPP2 identifies the measures set out in the Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012, which were considered by the RACCE Committee in 2011.

139. The Zero Waste Plan sets the following waste management targets—

- the proportion of household waste and subsequently recycled, composted and/or prepared for re-use. The targets are 40% by 2010, 50% by 2013, 60% by 2020 and 70% by 2025;
- recycling 70% of all waste (including commercial and industrial waste) by 2025;
- reducing the proportion of total waste sent to landfill to a maximum of 5% of all waste by 2025; and
- by 2050, the achievement of the full recycling of all waste with no need for landfill.

140. The Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012 introduced policies to ultimately end waste being sent to landfill. The policies introduced by the regulations cover domestic and business sectors, and included—

- a requirement for businesses to present dry recyclables (metals, plastics, paper, card and glass) and food waste for collection;
- a requirement on local authorities to provide householders with a collection service for dry recyclables and food waste;
- a ban on materials collected separately for recycling going to landfill or incineration; and
- introducing a ban on biodegradable municipal waste going to landfill by the end of 2020.

---

141. The draft RPP2 states that “using materials more efficiently and preventing waste is fundamental to addressing the carbon impacts”\(^5^1\), references a new Resource Efficient Scotland service and states the new service will—

“provide a more accessible integrated business and public sector energy and resource efficiency service with a focus on implementation to maximise the carbon and financial benefits of resource efficiency actions.”\(^5^2\)

142. James Curran noted the successes there have been in the waste handling and management sector and said it could be used as case study for how other areas of climate change mitigation could be approached. He added—

“What has happened in waste management has demonstrated that if we allocate responsibility and accountability for a particular programme of work, all the detailed analysis, focused funding and everything else that will enable us to deliver against the targets that have been set will follow.”\(^5^3\)

143. However, James Curran also noted there was further work now required regarding consumer waste and a lot more could be done in terms of—

- leading on the development of environmental and clean technologies;
- taking a more national and strategic approach to the development of infrastructure to support the zero waste plan; and
- better advice to SMEs and other businesses to respond by going through an “MOT” which would include an expectation of seeking advice on waste issues.

144. SCCS raised a number of concerns\(^5^4\) about the waste chapter of the draft RPP2, issues which were raised in other written and oral evidence received by the Committee. These were—

- emissions reduction targets from the waste sector were heavily reliant on policies that existed before 2010;
- there were no concrete proposals in the draft RPP2 to create a step-change in recycling rates and waste prevention;
- the draft RPP2 only identifies one additional waste proposal – additional methane recovery – which is uncertain;
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the figures are based on an assumption that there will be a general reduction in waste per person being generated, but there is no evidence base provided for that assumption;

abatement levels attributed to Zero Waste policies for each year between 2013 and 2022 has increased by between two and four times the abatement attributed to the same policy in RPP1 without clear explanation; and

the importance of the waste hierarchy is not evident in RPP2.

145. In its report on RPP1, the then Transport, Infrastructure and Climate Change Committee of the Scottish Parliament stated—

“[…] in developing the RPP, and in advance of the next RPP, the Scottish Government should consider wider issues in relation to waste and incorporate proposals in relation to all aspects of the waste hierarchy and not just on the issue of waste treatment.”

146. Stuart Fraser, the technical director of the William Tracey Group, noted it was perhaps unfortunate that the consultations on the waste hierarchy and the recyclate quality action plan had recently closed, and that the resulting information gathered by the consultation had not been included in the draft RPP2. However, he felt the direction of travel outlined in the consultation documents should provide some of the detail currently absent from the waste chapter in terms of resource use and efficiency.

147. With regard to whether the waste hierarchy, reduction of waste, and resource use should be more prominent in the draft RPP2, the Cabinet Secretary told the Committee the draft RPP2 focussed on the cause of emissions in the waste sector, which was methane from landfill. However, he added that he would consider how the final document could better reflect some of the issues discussed in Committee.

148. With regard to reducing the amount of waste produced per person, and resource use, the Cabinet Secretary admitted Scotland was behind other countries in this area but said work was underway to improve this and that better use of the resource from waste would lead to a reduction in waste produced by person. He told the Committee—

“We are looking at a target, on which we have consulted, of reducing the waste that is produced by 15 per cent by 2025. It is fair to say that, in the past, we have not had targets specifically for reducing the amount of waste that we produce in the first place as a country, but we have looked at that issue as part of our recent safeguarding Scotland’s resources consultation, in which many other waste-reducing measures have been looked at, such as

single-use carrier bag taxes or levies and other measures that are currently in the mix.”

149. In terms of the comments made in evidence that abatement levels in the draft RPP2 attributed to the waste policies for each year between 2013 and 2022 had significantly increased compared to what had been stated in RPP1, the Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that the data was now more robust due to further research and scientific development.

Proposals
150. The document lists one additional proposal in the waste sector, which is additional methane recovery from a variety of sources, such as closed or inactive landfill sites. This is listed in Annexe A of the draft RPP2, in the waste and resource and efficiency table, as a proposal for “Enhanced Capture of Landfill Gas”.

151. The Committee notes the draft RPP2 outlines projected abatement for the “enhanced capture of landfill gas” proposal, beginning at 22 ktCO2e in 2013, rising steadily to 140 ktCO2e in 2027.

152. The Committee explored with the Cabinet Secretary whether the single additional proposal in the waste chapter of the draft RPP2 was sufficient in providing enough “plan Bs”. The Committee notes that the draft RPP2 outlines projected abatement for the “enhanced capture of landfill gas” proposal, beginning at 22 ktCO2e in 2013, rising steadily to 140 ktCO2e in 2027.

153. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that if emissions which come from landfill could be reduced by 92%, a plan B might not be required. However, he noted that the proposal was being investigated currently by Zero Waste Scotland, which will report to the Scottish Government on the issue and that the final report would inform future policy decisions.

Additional issues
154. Additional issues were also raised in evidence. Linda Ovens told the Committee that she was surprised that the waste chapter focussed on landfill gas emissions as she felt there were other areas which were more pertinent within the industry at the moment, such as resource management. She noted issues such as food waste reduction and decreasing biodegradable waste would make the targets in the draft RPP2 challenging to meet because of the lower amount of waste that would go to landfill. She noted there was evidence which showed waste was decreasing, with a 3% decrease in local-authority collected waste generated over the past 5-6 years. If this trend were to continue, this would obviously have an effect on the need for waste infrastructure, such as energy from waste. However, she felt there would always be an element of waste, however successful the Zero Waste Plan was, that would be landfillable or have the potential as an energy source.

155. Stuart Fraser told the Committee that, given the behaviour change issues relating to waste which have been discussed above, there now needed to be a stronger message regarding support for energy from waste. He told the Committee—

“There is still a perception among the general public that energy recovery is a contentious and difficult issue, and that leads to a lot of opposition to the facilities that we will need to deliver our complete landfill diversion target. There needs to be a stronger message on that.”

156. Stuart Fraser also told the Committee that he felt there was an omission from the waste chapter in the draft RPP2, in that there should be a stronger link to the proposed procurement reform bill, adding that the zero waste plan and subsequent regulations set a good framework, and the policies were all in place, but without recognition of what was required in terms of sustainable procurement, the desired outcomes would not be delivered in full.

157. The Committee notes the positive comments made in evidence regarding some of the substantial achievements that have been made to date, under the Scottish Government’s Zero Waste Plan and Zero Waste Regulations, particularly in terms of driving behaviour change in management of domestic waste. The Committee welcomes the successes to date and believes it is important that these be built upon.

158. However, the Committee acknowledges the criticisms that have been made in evidence regarding the waste chapter of the draft RPP2. In particular, the Committee notes the comments made regarding the waste chapter being disproportionately focussed on reducing methane emissions from landfill sites, rather than on the waste hierarchy, reducing waste, and resource use. The Committee believes that whilst it is appropriate for the chapter to contain details of how landfill emissions will continue to be reduced, it would be helpful if the Scottish Government find space in the final RPP2 to give greater prominence to the waste hierarchy, reducing waste, and resource use, alongside the information currently in the waste chapter of the draft document.

159. Whilst the Committee did not receive a great deal of evidence on the waste to energy issue, as it largely falls with the remit of the Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee, it notes the comments made regarding the importance of the Scottish Government supporting a strong positive message regarding waste to energy issues.

160. Finally, the Committee notes the comments made about the apparent failure of the draft RPP2 to address the linkages between the waste chapter and the Scottish Government’s forthcoming procurement reform bill and recommends the Scottish Government ensures that a clear synergy between the two is arrived at.

---

Rural land use – general

161. Chapter 9 of the draft RPP2 covers rural land use issues and, as with the chapter on waste, sets them out in the order of ambitions; the current picture; policies; proposals; supporting and enabling measures; costs and benefits; and, finally, a summary of the projected abatement. Each of these sections covers three specific policy areas – agriculture; peatland restoration; and forestry. The Committee addresses each of these three policy areas in turn below.

162. The draft RPP2 states that “sustainable land use is the bedrock of any credible plan for a low carbon transition”.58 For the rural land use sector, the draft RPP2 sets out that a Low Carbon Scotland would encompass the following—

- “By 2027 land managers will have further optimised the productive use of natural resources, producing food and delivering public goods, such as protecting the natural environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions; and
- By 2027 we will have enhanced natural carbon capture through our expanded woodlands and significantly more conservation of peatland”.59

163. The James Hutton Institute stated—

“We were very concerned to note that the estimated emission reductions by 2020 from policies relating to the Rural Land Use sector had been reduced from 645 ktCO2e yr in RPP1 to 413 ktCO2e yr in RPP2, leaving a shortfall of 222 ktCO2e yr to be found from other options. This means that there is an over-reliance on the proposals rather than policies to achieve these targets in the sector, and an expectation that these reductions will be achieved post-2020 […] Our concern is that unless all of these proposals are fully implemented as policies delivering real net emission reductions, then the Rural Land Use sector will not be able to meet its pro rata targets in 2020 and 2050.”60

164. The draft RPP2 also states, after paragraph 9.5.15, that it is the Scottish Government’s intention to include, in RPP3, a proposal to realise additional technical abatement from changes to land use in 2027 of approximately 0.75 MtCO2e.

165. The Committee questioned witnesses on this issue and Jim Densham from SE Link confirmed it had had no notice of that part of the draft RPP2, and noted concern that it back-loaded significant abatement between 2025 and 2027, adding—

“In the technical annex of RPP2 there is not sufficient explanation of the proposal—there is talk about modelling and how it relates to other policies,

---
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but the issue is certainly not clear. Given that it is estimated that a lot of abatement will be achieved, we think that the explanation should be a lot clearer.\textsuperscript{61}

166. Professor Smith told the Committee that, in his view, the technical abatement between 2025 and 2027 could be explained as being the gap between what it is known could be achieved, and what is required to be achieved to meet the annual targets, adding it was “more like wishful thinking than something that has a plan behind it.”\textsuperscript{62}

167. The Minister told the Committee that the significant amount of abatement attributed to the rural land use sector between 2023 and 2027 was largely a result of many of the policies and proposals in this area having a time-lag in terms of implementation versus carbon benefits. He gave the examples of peatland restoration and forestry targets as policies and proposals which took several years to realise significant carbon benefits.

168. The Minister also told the Committee that he was aware of the critical remarks that had been made regarding the lack of detail on technical abatement policies, not only in the rural land use area, but in other sections of the draft RPP2. The Minister accepted that the final document may be able to provide more clarity on some of these technical abatements, but stressed that the sections were, to an extent, understandably vague because they were looking a long way into the future and therefore operating within a significant degree of uncertainty.

169. The Cabinet Secretary was also questioned on this issue, and pointed to the uncertainties of planning up to 2027, in 2013, and the difficulties in predicting what technology would be available. He noted that he shared the concerns expressed but that the draft RPP2 represented the current best estimate, and that RPP3 would provide more detail and that proposals may change.

170. The Committee notes concerns raised in evidence that the rural land use section, in general, relies too heavily on proposals rather than policies and the projected abatement from policies in the rural land use section of the draft RPP2 has been reduced, compared to RPP1. The Committee also notes concerns that the required abatement is overly reliant on the proposal titled “additional technical potential from low carbon land use” which projects abatement in 2025-2027 of between 250 and 750 ktCO2e. Evidence given to the Committee criticised this proposal for lacking detail on how the large amounts of projected abatement would be achieved.

171. The Committee sympathises with these concerns and recommends the final RPP2 document give a more robust, and policy focussed assessment of how carbon emissions will be reduced across the Rural Land Use sector.


172. The Committee also recommends the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 document includes further detail on the “additional technical potential from low carbon land use” proposal in particular.

Rural land use – agriculture

Policies
173. With regard to agriculture, the policies in the draft RPP2 relate principally to the Scottish Government’s Farming for a Better Climate (FFBC) programme. The draft RPP2 recognises there are issues around uptake of the measures included in this programme and that regulation may be required.

174. It was noted by SCCS in written evidence that, in its opinion, agriculture sector emissions reductions had been achieved since the 1990 baseline but was of the view that this was due to drivers outwith RPP1 policies, such as a reduction in livestock numbers and reduced fertiliser use due to increased costs.

175. Professor Smith stressed to the Committee that, with the backdrop of a likely increasing global demand for food security and production, it was essential that Scotland aimed for a thriving agriculture sector which was as low carbon as possible. He noted that whilst it may help Scottish emissions reductions to reduce agricultural activity or output, this would simply mean moving the resulting emissions to other parts of the world, which would not address the global climate change challenge.

176. Andrew Bauer from NFUS noted the public needed to develop a better understanding of the practicalities of agriculture and what compromises would need to be reached if the sector was to significantly reduce its carbon emissions—

“The public are in denial, to some extent. They think that they can have farmers producing food halfway up a mountain at rock-bottom prices, but they cannot have everything. There is a set of conflicts, and the debate about the issues has to mature.”

177. The projected abatement from the FFBC scheme is 50 ktCO2e in 2013, rising slowly but steadily to a figure of 107ktCO2e by 2027. Given the overall projected abatement in 2027 from rural land use policies is 794 ktCO2e, it seems clear to the Committee that the FFBC scheme is a relatively small contributor to emissions reductions.

178. The abatement estimates from the FFBC scheme have been reduced from the estimates in the RPP1, which the SCCS said, “shows a greater realism and is appropriate.” However, SCCS went on to add—

“However, FFBC is not adequately monitored (para 9.4.5 of RPP2), both in terms of measure uptake or coverage across Scotland and therefore, we
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believe that attributing abatement or a progress statement to FFBC is, at best, guesswork.”

179. Graham Kerr, from Scotland’s Rural College (SRUC), noted, in light of the discussion about improved agricultural production and emissions reductions, that three of the four FFBC focus farms had seen improved production, with the fourth showcasing renewable energy.

180. The Cabinet Secretary for Rural Affairs and the Environment told the Committee that the Scottish Government will conduct a survey of the FFBC programme later this year in order to better understand how farmers have engaged with the programme, and to assess its current strengths and weaknesses with a view to refreshing and refocusing the programme subsequently, if that is deemed necessary.

181. The Cabinet Secretary also told the Committee that “we will review Government expenditure on the programme” and added that the challenge ahead was how to ensure that every farm in Scotland had a carbon reduction plan in place, and felt the FFBC programme had a key role to play in this. However, he added that other countries had carried out brief assessments of to what extent their farms had such plans in place, and noted that was something the Scottish Government might well wish to look at for Scotland. He added that a stakeholder working group on agriculture and climate change would be taking forward thinking on this issue.

182. The Cabinet Secretary also told the Committee that a key plank of the FFBC programme was optimising livestock management, which was all about reducing the release of methane. He said the SRUC were looking at this issue in depth, particularly through its Green Cow research initiative, which is examining options for changing feeds and the effects on methane levels.

183. The Committee supports the Scottish Government’s Farming for a Better Climate Programme, and having visited one of the four focus farms last year saw the benefits of the programme at first hand. The Committee is also encouraged to learn that production has increased on three of the four focus farms, with the fourth showcasing renewable energy projects.

184. However, the Committee believes the number of focus farms now needs to be increased, and the reach of the programme extended, with a view to ramping-up emissions reductions across the agriculture sector in Scotland, whilst retaining required production levels, and rolling out best practice. The Committee notes the Cabinet Secretary’s commitment to review funding of the programme and would seek an update on this ahead of the next draft budget being laid in Parliament.

185. The Committee also welcomes the Cabinet Secretary's commitment to evaluate the Farming for a Better Climate programme and recommends the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 is more explicit in setting out the details of this is to be implemented to better demonstrate how the Farming
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for a Better Climate programme will be monitored and evaluated, including how uptake of measures can be better understood.

186. The Committee also notes the Cabinet Secretary’s ambition for every farm in Scotland to have a carbon reduction plan in place, and further notes his comments regarding the work that has been carried out in some other countries to assess to what extent their farms had such plans. The Committee supports the Cabinet Secretary in this overarching ambition and recommends the final RPP2 document sets this out clearly for the future, with the agriculture section of the document acting as a route map for achieving this transformational change.

187. The Committee also recommends that the Scottish Government report back to the Committee on how Scotland can take forward the work, already underway in some other countries, to assess the carbon footprint and carbon reduction activities in place for every farm in Scotland.

188. The Committee welcomes the Green Cow research facility initiative and recommends the Scottish Government update the Committee, when appropriate, on—

- how the work of the facility is changing livestock feed make-up;
- the success of this in reducing methane levels; and
- plans to support uptake amongst farmers of any subsequent changes to feed make-up.

Proposals

189. The draft RPP2 contains a new proposal to achieve 90% uptake of nitrogen efficiency measures amongst farmers and introduces the potential of regulations to support the uptake of such measures.

190. SCCS welcomed the inclusion of this measure but noted disappointment that the proposal does not include a date when regulations would be introduced if uptake were deemed to be insufficient. SE Link agreed with this point, calling for a date for introduction of regulations to be clarified, and a regulatory trigger set out in the draft RPP2. SEPA also queried, in its written evidence, what measures would come forward if the 90% uptake ambition were not realised.

191. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that the draft RPP2 sought to strike an appropriate balance between avoiding additional bureaucracy in the farming industry, and ensuring there was maximum uptake of the nitrogen efficiency measures. He noted that he wanted to avoid regulation if possible, and would prefer if the measures could be achieved voluntarily, through education, encouragement and demonstrating the benefits of implementation. He concluded that the inclusion of possible regulation in the draft RPP2 was very much a “plan B” should the voluntary approach not prove successful.

192. The Committee notes that the carbon abatement projected for the nitrogen efficiency proposal outlined in the draft RPP2 shows no abatement up to and
including 2017, then abatement of 260 ktCO2e in 2018 and every subsequent year until 2027. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that these figures reflected the fact that there was currently limited data on this issue and that the figures were a projection of what abatement could be expected. Andrew Henderson, a Policy Officer in the Directorate for Energy and Climate Change in the Scottish Government added that sometimes, in preparing the document, a date had to be selected to begin counting abatement, hence the sudden increase in the figures.

193. The Committee sought clarity on how the nitrogen efficiency proposal sat within the FFBC programme, to ensure figures were not being double-counted for both programmes. Dr Antje Branding, Head of Agri Renewables in the Scottish Government, told the Committee that efforts had been made in the preparation of the figures contained in the draft RPP2, and in the technical annex, to ensure there was no double-counting between the FFBC policy, and the nitrogen efficiency proposals.

194. The Committee welcomes the proposal to achieve 90% uptake amongst farmers of nitrogen efficiency measures, and to potentially introduce regulation to support the uptake of such measures if required. However, the Committee also notes concerns raised in evidence that the proposal required clarity in terms of when it would become a policy and the circumstances in which regulations would be triggered.

195. The Committee therefore recommends the Scottish Government reflect on the wording of this proposal with a view to providing greater clarity in the final document on these issues.

196. With regard to other proposals, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, the document also lists areas for consideration such as “developments in agricultural technology from 2020” and “livestock management measures” but does not give a great deal of detail on which any assessment or scrutiny could be usefully based. The technical annex provides some more detail on issues, but suggests no concrete proposals.

197. In terms of the “developments in agricultural technology from 2020” proposal, which includes possible increased uptake of livestock management measures and increased uptake of anaerobic digestion technology, the Committee notes the draft RPP2 projects abatement from this proposal beginning in 2020, and delivering 310 ktCO2e of abatement, annually, until 2027. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government provide greater clarity in the final RPP2 on how that figure has been arrived at, and how the Government intends to take the proposal forward between now and 2020.

198. The Committee comments in several places in this report on its general concern regarding the uncertainty of proposals such as these and, again, recommends the Scottish Government provides reassurance on this issue in the final RPP document.
Additional issues – behaviour change, approach and benefits

199. The proposal also led to a discussion during Committee meetings with stakeholders about the pros and cons of voluntary and mandatory approaches to securing emissions reductions. Several witnesses stressed that behaviour change amongst farmers was a key challenge, as has already been noted in the section on behaviour change above, and that it was important that benefits, other than financial benefits, were made clear to farmers. Andrew Bauer from NFUS told the Committee—

“The sector might accept that it has not embraced the climate change agenda as quickly or as fully as some other parts of the economy. We have to be honest with ourselves in that regard. The farming for a better climate initiative has done a great job in setting out the playing field. I have with me our membership magazine, which contains the first of six articles that are being produced for us by SAC Consulting. The NFUS, Scottish Land & Estates, SAC Consulting and others can start to communicate to people, but we are talking about 20,000 businesses. If you want to influence power generation, you go and talk to two companies. That is done quickly. The behaviour and the complexities around that are going to be the biggest challenge.”

200. The Committee does not underestimate the great challenge ahead in achieving effective and wide-reaching behaviour change across the agriculture sector. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government make it a priority to address this issue, considering the resource, methodology and collaborative working that may be required, and recommends that the final RPP2 document provides information on how the Scottish Government plans to take this forward and evaluate success in the years ahead.

Additional issues – anaerobic digestion

201. It was noted in evidence to the Committee that a specific proposal for anaerobic digestion measures does not appear in the draft RPP2, as it did in RPP1. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee the anaerobic digestion proposals contained in RPP1 had been overtaken by events, which is why they were not included in the draft RPP2. He said that, since RPP1 was published, it has become apparent that it is often more economical for farmers to make use of other funding for anaerobic digestion projects, such as Feed-In Tariffs, rather than Scottish Government grants. This reduced role for the Scottish Government led to the removal of the proposal from the draft RPP2.

202. The Committee notes the evidence it received regarding the absence in the draft RPP2 of the specific anaerobic digestion proposal that was in RPP1. The Committee also notes the Cabinet Secretary’s explanation for this.

203. However, the Committee notes that the draft RPP2 document is not intended only to outline Scottish Government funded activity, and therefore
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recommends that the Scottish Government reconsider adding details of anaerobic digestion activity to the final RPP2 document to ensure it captures, and accounts for, all carbon abatement schemes, however they are funded.

Additional issues – Common Agriculture Policy
204. SCCS and SE Link both noted that the proposal for mandatory climate change measures through the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) also does not feature in RPP2, as it did in RPP1. Whilst noting that the CAP reform negotiations are on-going, a recommendation came forward in several contributions to the Committee that the proposal be reinstated into RPP2.

205. The Cabinet Secretary explained that as negotiations had not yet been concluded, it was not possible to include details of outcomes in the draft RPP2. He highlighted the continuing debate on the greening proposals (proposals to link receipt of direct farming payments to various prescribed environmental objectives) as an example of an area that could have a significant impact on carbon reduction but which had not yet been finalised. He added, however, that he believed carbon reduction should be a central factor of any greening measures but that, at the present time, it did not look likely that this would be the case.

206. The Cabinet Secretary also noted that recent agreement on the size of the EU budget could have a negative impact on the amount of CAP Pillar 2 funding coming to Scotland through the Scotland Rural Development Programme, or equivalent scheme. Should this prove to be the case, he said, it sharpened the focus on how to best spend the money Scotland would have available, and he believed reducing carbon emissions should be a key plank of desired outcome from the available funding.

207. The Committee notes evidence received recommending the Scottish Government reinstate the proposal for mandatory climate change measures to be implemented through the CAP, which was contained in RPP1. The Committee notes the CAP reform process has not yet concluded within the EU, and it is therefore not clear how the reformed CAP will address climate change issues, through direct funding (Pillar 1) or rural development support (Pillar 2). The Committee will continue to take evidence on the reform of the CAP and monitor developments with interest, providing comment where it deems it necessary and appropriate.

Rural land use – forestry

Policies
208. The main policy outlined in this area remains the Scottish Government’s planting target. The current target of 10,000 hectares per year from 2015 onwards is restated in the document, but the draft RPP2 also states that 100,000 hectares of new woodland would be planted by 2022, which could see a change in planting profile per year. This is important because net carbon sequestration rates at the moment are currently reducing year-on-year due to the lower proportion of young trees in Scottish forests. The draft RPP2 also highlights the rollout of the Woodland Carbon Code.
209. The new planting target of 100,000 hectares by 2022 was welcomed by the Wood Panel Industries Federation (WPIF), which stated—

“The WPIF also welcomes RPP2’s new woodland creation target of 100,000 hectares of new woodland by 2022 and the benefit this will have in terms of utilising the important carbon sequestration properties of forests. Woodland creation is very important to the wood panel industry as well as the wider forestry sector, particularly in light of the current competition for domestic wood from the energy sector.”\(^{67}\)

210. The Committee explored the issue of the draft RPP2 appearing to contain two different planting targets, one of 10,000 hectares per year until 2022, and another of 100,000 hectares in total by 2022. Whilst these may appear to be essentially the same, the latter target would allow for rates to vary considerably year-on-year as long as the end resulted in 100,000 hectares of new woodland. Jo Ellis from the Forestry Commission Scotland sought to reassure the Committee, saying—

“There is no real difference between a target of 10,000 hectares a year and the target of 100,000 hectares over 10 years. The change simply reflects the idea that if, for some reason, planting rates go down in one year, the forestry sector should ensure that the average is maintained over the period. There is no particular difference there, as the aim is to continue to plant 10,000 hectares a year. If the rate went down in one year, we would like to think that the difference could be made up a bit in the next year.”\(^{68}\)

211. The Minister confirmed this, telling the Committee that both targets remain in place as ambitions for the Scottish Government. Jo Ellis confirmed annual planting figures would be published and that in 2012, the planting rate had been 9,000 hectares.

212. The commitment to planting targets in the draft RPP2 was welcomed by several respondents and witnesses, including BSW Timber, which also welcomed the acceptance of the Woodland Expansion Advisory Group’s recommendation for a pre-2020 review to set new targets for woodland expansion beyond 2022. BSW Timber also stated—

“It is also positive that the report highlights ongoing research to improve the accuracy of the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory in estimating emissions from land use. This research should also look at emissions from Land Use Change and Forestry, including considering taking into account the carbon stock in harvested wood products when calculating emissions as the European Commission is currently doing.”\(^{69}\)

213. Although the planting rate policy extends to 2022, the draft RPP2 contains abatement figures for the policy through to 2027. Jo Ellis explained that, for
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illustrative purposes, the document had used the current policy target of 10,000 hectares for each of the years from 2022 to 2027, adding—

“The draft report says that it does not include projections for increasing or decreasing that, because we do not know at this stage what the right thing to do will be from 2022 onwards.”

214. Dr Bob McIntosh, from the Forestry Commission Scotland, told the Committee that the Woodland Expansion Advisory Group agreed it was not sensible to set long-term targets, but rather to look about ten years ahead, then review the targets in about eight years’ time, to then look another ten years ahead.

215. In terms of what the Scottish Government, Forestry Commission Scotland and the private sector were going to do to ensure the 100,000 hectare target was met, Jo Ellis stressed that the forestry industry was working hard to achieve more woodland creation with the support of FCS grants and other support, in the form of working with nurseries and the processing sector. Andrew Midgley, from Scottish Land and Estates, supported this, noting there was full buy-in from the sector, adding—

“The key issue is the continuity of support. The SRDP plays a critical role in underpinning the meeting of planting targets. One artefact in how the SRDP works is that the funding is not stable—it goes through cycles. A critical problem in the immediate future is how to achieve funding between programmes. The commission is doing a lot to ensure that the impact of the funding cycles is limited and to achieve continuity. There is a great deal of demand. The issue is how to marry up the two elements.”

216. The Committee pursued with the Minister the issue of some of the tensions between use of land for farming and forestry, and the purchasing of farms by the Forestry Commission for tree planting. The Minister confirmed there was a joined-up approach in this area, which involves the integration of farming and forestry interests.

217. The Committee is supportive of the Scottish Government’s aim to increase woodland cover, where appropriate, in Scotland, and of a yearly planting rate policy of an average of 10,000 hectares per year, ensuring 100,000 hectares of new woodland by 2022.

218. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government make the final RPP2 clearer in terms of the relationship between the 10,000 per year annual target and the 100,000 hectare by 2022 target.

219. The Committee accepts that, as the Scottish Government’s planting target is only set until 2022, the draft RPP2 has used the current target to project abatement between 2023 and 2027. However, the Committee recommends the Scottish Government ensure the planting targets beyond
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Proposals

2022 are set as early as is practicable, with the aim of ensuring they are clearly set out in RPP3.

220. The only forestry proposal in the draft RPP2 is to continue to investigate the potential for emissions abatement by increasing the amount of Scottish timber used in the construction and refurbishment of buildings.

221. The draft RPP2 states this proposal—

“will require more than simply promoting the benefits of timber as a construction material. The potential role of planning, building standards and building design will be considered, as must issues of competitiveness and the need to avoid perverse incentives that might encourage the use of timber in inappropriate circumstances. Work also needs to be undertaken to ensure that emissions abatement can be estimated effectively, avoiding double counting.”

222. In its written submission, SCCS welcomed the new proposal to promote the use of Scottish timber in construction, as timber has lower embedded carbon than other construction materials. However, the SCCS felt there was an overreliance on tree planting targets to deliver the rural land use abatement ambition, given planting targets had not been formalised past 2022.

223. Jo Ellis told the Committee the FCS was working with Edinburgh Napier University and other industry partners to develop innovative wood products that could make best use of Scottish timber, with a particular focus on construction. She added—

“We are also working with planners, building standards officials, architects and others who specify the use of timber, to try to increase the demand for it. We are working up to the aim that the proposal should make a significant contribution by the time that we get to RPP2.”

224. The proposal was supported by BSW Timber, and by the Wood Panel Industries Federation, which stated—

“Using wood in construction is a far more sustainable and environmentally friendly use of this finite resource than burning it for energy generation and the WPIF welcomes the Scottish Government’s recognition of the importance of wood as a construction product.

The WPIF supports the work being done by FCS, Scottish Enterprise, Edinburgh Napier University and a range of SMEs on a Wood Products Innovation Gateway research programme to develop and commercialise wood products, processes and systems in order to exploit the market opportunities of wood as a low energy building material, for example
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‘exploring the potential for manufacturing cross-laminated timber panels using Scottish soft wood.’ This is further positive recognition of the benefits of using wood in construction and the WPIF supports these research efforts.”  

225. The Minister told the Committee that there was a lot of work going on to improve the science and whilst progress was slow, it was heading in the right direction.

226. The Committee welcomes the proposal to continue to investigate the potential for emissions abatement by increasing the amount of Scottish timber used in the construction and refurbishment of buildings.

227. Whilst noting the many and varied challenges that lie ahead in seeking such an increase, as outlined in the draft RPP2, the Committee recommends that the Scottish Government seeks to bring about the collaborative effort required to make this a reality, and clarify in the final RPP2 document who will be responsible for coordinating the project and securing the necessary investment.

Rural land use – peatland

Policies

228. Chapter 9, paragraphs 9.4.7 to 9.4.10, outline the Scottish Government’s policies regarding peatland restoration, whilst paragraphs 9.5.9 to 9.5.11 outline proposals. In the section on supporting and enabling measures, paragraph 9.6.2 states the Scottish Government is working with other UK administrations to reduce and eventually phase out the use of peat in horticulture. Paragraphs 9.7.4 and 9.7.5 deal with the costs and benefits of peatland restoration. Finally, the abatement summary states that the proposal to accelerate restoration of degraded peatland could begin, at the earliest, in 2013, and would lead to 177 ktCO2e of emissions abatement by 2020, and 515 ktCO2e of emissions abatement by 2027.

229. Policies outlined include recognising work within Scottish emissions accounting, and noting the existing funding of £1.7m for peatland restoration between 2012 and 2015. The document also states that the Scottish Government will assess the effectiveness of this funding before considering whether to employ further proposals.

230. Evidence given to the Committee was overwhelmingly positive regarding the inclusion of peatlands in the draft RPP2 and welcomed the £1.7m of dedicated funding for peatland restoration work.

231. However, Clifton Bain, the Peatland Programme Manager, IUCN, was amongst witnesses who felt that, as welcome as the committed funding was, it would need to be significantly increased to achieve the level of restoration required. He told the Committee that other funding possibilities should be explored, such as whether downstream beneficiaries could be involved in funding restoration projects.
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232. The Committee raised this issue with the Minister, who said in response—

“Many companies invest in environmental projects through corporate social responsibility programmes. We might be able to encourage some of them to switch their investments from more traditional ways of delivering environmental benefit to new areas such as peatland restoration to accelerate the rate of investment.”

233. Professor Smith told the Committee that once restoration was underway it was essential that progress be monitored and emissions measured, in order to establish a baseline from which to measure progress, evaluate the efficacy of the restoration.

234. The Committee joins witnesses in welcoming the inclusion of peatland restoration in the draft RPP2, and in the restated commitment from the Scottish Government to provide £1.7m of funding for restoration projects between 2012 and 2015.

235. However, it is also clear to the Committee that additional funding may be needed if the levels of restoration required are to be achieved and sustained. The Committee therefore recommends that the Scottish Government give consideration to the scope for increasing funding levels for peatland restoration in the next Spending Review and explore the opportunities for innovative funding mechanisms to support restoration, such as investment by private and public downstream beneficiaries.

236. The Committee further supports calls made in evidence for restoration to be properly monitored and measured and recommends the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 document sets out how this will be achieved.

Proposals

237. In the proposals section, the draft RPP2 outlines that the Scottish Government and Scottish Natural Heritage are developing a Peatland Plan which could include increasing the restoration rate to 21,000 hectares per annum (although RPP2 does not give a current baseline figure). This work could lead to a peatland carbon code, as outlined in paragraph 9.5.11 of the draft RPP2.

238. There was a consensus in comment to the Committee on this proposal that it was disappointing that it was not a firm policy. Many witnesses also felt that there was scope to go beyond the proposal. RSPB Scotland stated—

“We believe that there is scope to go beyond the 21,000ha figure for restoration by building on the partnership working and coordination already underway in Scotland. Local authorities, Forestry Commission, Scottish Water, Scottish Natural Heritage must come together to commit to realising this target and work with Scotland’s Moorland Forum, Peatland Working Group, IUCN UK Peatland Programme, Scotland’s 2020 Climate Group and

---

many other NGOs and organisations to restore degraded peatlands. Through coordination, Scotland can lead the way in seeing climate change mitigation and adaptation, water quality and biodiversity benefits from peatland restoration.\textsuperscript{76}

239. In response to this, the Minister told the Committee that he believed it was premature to set the 21,000 hectare proposal as a policy at this stage, due to a number of factors: the work that still needs to be completed in establishing greater certainty regarding the science and methodology; uncertainty regarding future SRDP funds; a planned consultation in the summer of this year; and pending IPCC agreement on how emissions will be calculated. He explained the proposal was therefore intended to set out clearly the intended direction of travel and scale of ambition.

240. The Committee welcomes the Scottish Government’s preparation of a Peatland Plan, in conjunction with SNH, and its considering establishing a peatland carbon code.

241. However, the Committee notes comments made to it that the proposal in the draft RPP2 that the Peatland Plan could include an increase in restoration of peatland to 21,000 hectares per year should be formalised as a policy in the final document. The Committee also notes the evidence it received which suggested that even a policy of 21,000 hectares of restoration per year would be cautious, and suggesting the proposal/policy could be even more ambitious.

242. The Committee sympathises with these views, but notes the comments made by the Minister that it was premature to set the 21,000 aim as a specific policy at this stage, in advance of further scientific research, an intended consultation on the issue, and clarification of wider issues such as the future of rural development funding and IPCC agreement on exactly how emissions will be calculated and incorporated.

243. The Committee recommends that the Scottish Government’s planned consultation on this issue examines specifically the level of support for, and appropriateness of, the 21,000 hectare per year proposal becoming a policy. If the determination is favourable and other current areas of uncertainty are clarified, the Committee encourages the Scottish Government to adopt the proposed target at the earliest possible opportunity.

244. The Committee also explored some other issues relevant to peatland restoration. SEPA outlined the importance that development and land use planning had in maximising the benefits of peatlands—

\begin{quote}
“In our evidence to the Local Government and Regeneration Committee and the Economy, Energy and Tourism Committee, we have argued that a strategic locational framework is needed that protects peatlands from development. It is far easier – and cheaper - to protect pristine peatlands and thereby ensure that their carbon remains locked up and that they continue to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{76} RSPB Scotland. Written submission.
sequester more, than to try to re-capture the amount of carbon that is lost once the peatlands are disturbed or drained.”

245. SEPA also noted the benefits of front-loading restoration activity, stating—

“We would urge that restoration works, where needed to address historic damage, or where necessary from active developments, are undertaken as quickly as possible in order to minimise the carbon losses. There is also benefit in developing restoration action now as the net accounting approach allows all gains from 1990 to be included in the next reporting phase of Kyoto.”

246. From evidence given to the Committee, it is apparent that research in this area has continued to improve the evidence base. However, the technical annex to the draft RPP2 suggests there is still some uncertainty around this issue in terms of evidence and data. Clifton Bain confirmed this to the Committee, stating, “The quantification of the benefits still has a long way to go [...]”. He went on to tell the Committee—

“We need to improve the research and the science, but we must not let that stop the steamroller of policy development. The policy development is needed to deliver our biodiversity objectives for peatlands anyway, so it is work that we should be doing. The restoration rate since 1990 has been quite small, so the biodiversity gains and carbon gains have been small. If we ramp up to 20,000 hectares a year, we can achieve our objectives.”

247. Clifton Bain also spoke to the Committee about the coordination, funding and partnerships that would be necessary to realise the ambitions of the peatland restoration proposal. Alan Hampson from SNH told the Committee that the peatland plan would look to address many of these issues.

248. The Committee notes the proposal made by SEPA that a strategic locational framework be put in place to protect peatlands from inappropriate development and recommends that the Scottish Government work with SEPA to develop this proposal further.

249. The Committee notes the comments made in evidence that there could be significant benefit in front-loading restoration activity, especially to the most degraded peatlands. The Committee recommends the Scottish Government outline in the final RPP2 how it will facilitate the intended pace of restoration activity, and seek to front-load as much of this work as possible.

---

77 SEPA. Written submission.
78 SEPA. Written submission.
Other issues

Blue carbon

250. The issue of blue carbon was raised in both written and oral evidence. Rory Crawford, the seabird policy officer at RSPB Scotland, and representative of SE Link’s marine task force, noted marine issues were largely absent from the draft RPP2 (aside from mentions of maritime transport and marine renewable energy), but were important in looking for further carbon abatement; a point with which Alan Hampson from SNH agreed. Rory Crawford noted that the impacts of climate change could clearly be seen in the marine environment, and had significant effects on marine species, and was of the view that in addition to the marine environment playing a role in assessing impacts, it could also make a notable contribution to carbon abatement.

251. Rory Crawford eloquently outlined the opportunities for abatement in the marine environment—

“Scotland has a vast marine area that is much larger than its land area, and blue carbon sinks are critical. They could be viewed and embraced in the same way as peatlands and peatland restoration. We should look at blue carbon in the same way. When we refer to blue carbon, we are talking about things such as kelp beds, sea grass beds and salt marshes. The latter are particularly interesting because they are hugely important for biodiversity. There are options to restore salt marshes that we have lost. Historically, there has been a huge decline in salt marshes around Scotland. There is potential there for a win-win situation. I worked on the Marine (Scotland) Bill when it was going through Parliament. That is another great piece of legislation that has come from the Scottish Parliament, alongside the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009. There is a duty in the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 for mitigation and adaptation for climate change. That provides an opportunity to use marine protected areas and other measures in the 2010 act to do something about blue carbon and better account for it.”

252. However, Rory Crawford also told the Committee there were currently some issues with measuring how much blue carbon is sequestered in the marine environment that were being worked on by organisations such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), adding—

“Whether the work is at a stage at which it can be fully considered within the RPP2 is another matter, but the area should at least be accounted for or recognised as something that requires further development and action.”

253. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee that blue carbon was a relatively new concept and that there were no policies or proposals in the draft RPP2 on the issue because it was premature to include any at this stage, due to the current uncertainties regarding the relevant research, science and data. However, he added that the inclusion of the scope for blue carbon sequestration was

considered by Marine Scotland ahead of the preparation of the draft RPP2 and that he would reflect on whether there should be reference to it in the final RPP2.

254. A comparison was made, by the Cabinet Secretary and the Scottish Government official, Andrew Henderson, with the peatland issue, in that peatland was not ready, in RPP1, for inclusion, but now that much more was known about the issue, it was included in more detail in RPP2. He indicated that blue carbon is at an even earlier stage of development, so is not ready for the draft RPP2, but will continue to be worked on. It was also noted that blue carbon was not currently included in the international framework for reporting on carbon emissions.

255. The Cabinet Secretary told the Committee—

“Over 2013-14, our agencies will carry out a lot of work on trying to understand more about blue carbon on our sea beds and its contribution as carbon sinks and so on. It is a very exciting area that links to many other policy initiatives; for example, what will be the role of the future marine protected area network under the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 and in protecting blue carbon.”\(^{83}\)

256. The Committee notes comments made in evidence that the draft RPP2 does not include reference to blue carbon or outline any policies or proposals for the contribution the marine environment could make to reducing emissions in this regard. The Committee also notes comments made, echoed by the Cabinet Secretary, regarding the on-going work in this area regarding developing a better understanding of how blue carbon could be most effectively measured and accounted for. The Committee therefore recommends that the Scottish Government continue to consider this issue, and develop and improve scientific research and understanding.

257. The Committee accepts it would not be appropriate for the final RPP2 document to set out detailed policies and proposals on the contribution blue carbon could make to reducing carbon emissions given the relatively early stage understanding of the issue is at. However, the Committee would like to see reference to it in the final document and therefore recommends that the Scottish Government ensure the final RPP2 acknowledges the contribution blue carbon could make to reducing emissions and sets out an ambitious route map for future development, which can be updated in RPP3.

National marine plan and marine protected areas

258. In terms of the consequences of increased use of marine renewable energy, Rory Crawford praised the Marine (Scotland) Act 2010 but regretted that a national marine plan had not yet been published, adding—

“It is critical that it is produced as soon as possible so that we have a strategic, plan-led process.”\(^{84}\)


\(^{84}\) Scottish Parliament Rural Affairs, Climate Change and Environment Committee. Official Report, 6 February 2013, Col 1697.
259. In its written evidence to the Committee, RSPB Scotland and SE Link highlighted protection of sensitive areas from the effects of marine renewables development as an area that should be included in the final RPP2.

260. The Cabinet Secretary confirmed that the Scottish Government would consult on a draft national marine plan, and on proposed marine protected areas, as well as on a marine renewables plan, in the summer of this year.

261. The Committee notes concerns raised regarding the delay in publication of Scotland’s national marine plan, and agrees that publication of the plan has become a matter of some urgency. The Committee welcomes the Scottish Government’s intention to consult on a draft plan in the summer of this year, and also welcomes the intention to run concurrent consultations on marine protected areas and a marine renewables plan.

Presentation of marine issues
262. Some evidence noted that there was no marine-specific section in the draft RPP2, which might have been helpful.

263. In response, the Cabinet Secretary noted—

“We did not have a marine section in the RPP2, because many of the marine issues are split across various parts of the document. For example, marine renewables fall under the energy section. We did not want to repeat things or be accused of double counting anything. There could have been a marine section, but it was decided not to have that, because it would have to bring together things that were already in other parts of the document. However, that is perhaps something to consider in the future.”

264. The Committee notes the comments made that the final RPP2 might benefit from the inclusion of a specific marine section, and/or improved presentation of issues relevant to the marine environment and welcomes the Cabinet Secretary’s remarks which indicate he is prepared to consider this issue before the RPP2 is finalised.
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